

NUCLEAR TALKS, WHAT NEXT?

THWARTING IRAN'S THREATS

MAY 30, 2012, 11:00 A.M.

THE WILLARD INTERCONTINENTAL HOTEL

CRYSTAL ROOM

1401 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC

## P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. MCCOLM: Welcome all of you. I am Bruce McCollm, the President of Global Initiative for Democracy. First please turn off your cell phones during the conference. I'm delighted to have another event like this on the urgent need of the nuclear talks that are going on.

Also in the past week, if you notice the leaking I guess, from our government about the Iranian plot to assassinate our diplomats in Azerbaijan and of course for those of you who went through 1988, like I did with you, the killings in Syria with the help of the Iranian forces just remind us, again, of the concern we have of the behavior and foreign policy goals of the Iranian regime.

We have a great panel today and I want to just say that this panel really helps elevate the cause of some of us about Camp Ashraf and the issue of de-listing and all I can say is really the time is really running out on this regime.

You may not think so. You may think these are great efforts of strength that they're showing but, in fact, the regime is incredibly weak. And it is going to be

assumed and probably in an unexpected event that will trigger the change in that government. It will be the younger generation, I'm totally convinced of this, that will finally say enough is enough.

But, please, we have got to keep our eye on the prize, the issue of Camp Ashraf. A year ago I was in Baghdad at this point and I'll tell you the temperatures are unbelievable at that time. It was 120 during the day when I was there. And to hear about these people in Camp Ashraf and Camp Liberty living in a cesspool without water, without generators for refrigeration is just sadistic. That's the point.

The Iraqi government wants to be sadistic and unfortunately the U.N. person on the ground, Kobler, is assisting in this. But let's say this: The United States Government has made a commitment that once everyone is out of Camp Ashraf, 60 days from then the MeK is de-listed and we must hold them to that point. And we must hold it -- remember in the Wall Street Journal, the State Department clearly said that they're going to de-list when everyone is out of Camp Ashraf and it's not conditional on the nuclear

arms talks so we have to hold them accountable for this.

In the meantime we also have to make sure that the people at Camp Ashraf and Camp Liberty are treated in a humane fashion which they're not being done today and for lots of reasons. Mainly because Iraqis would like to steal everything that isn't nailed down in Camp Ashraf.

All I can say we have a great panel today and I hope this indeed raises again consciousness about the issues really affecting all of us. We really can't go on being held hostage by this regime. It's apparently their way of, really, *modus operandi*. They hold their people hostage. They hold the world community hostage and finally, enough is enough. We really have to say no to the Iranian regime. And to moderate today is your old friend, an old supporter of the Iranian freedom is Tom Tancredo.

(Applause.)

MR. TANCREDO: Thank you. Thank you very much. It's a pleasure. It's a pleasure to be with you today. We do have a number of panelists to share their thoughts. Some of them have other commitments they have to make today so we're going to move fairly

quickly.

You know, we meet again here in the hope that we can speak to the conscious of the civilized world and in doing so force the governments to do something about the tragedy and to avert an even greater tragedy, a human catastrophe actually, in Iraq specifically and Ashraf.

The conditions there as we have noted are deplorable. They are also deplorable in the euphemistically named Camp Liberty. Nothing has improved. Life has not improved for the people who have moved already from Ashraf to Liberty. The situation there grows more intolerable and dangerous by the minute.

You know, prior to World War II, just before the start of the war, a ship full of Jewish refugees trying to escape the Nazi regime looking for a safe harbor, looking for somebody to take them in. They got here and they were refused. They were refused admittance. They were turned back. And at that point in time their fate was sealed.

And for over 60 years and probably forever this will be a stain on the history of the United States of America and other governments at the time who recognized the dangers but were afraid to do anything that might provoke a dictator.

Well, I hope that we don't ever have to look back at this situation in Iraq and in Ashraf in a similar vein and say, how could we not have done something? How could we not have acted more directly? More dramatically? How could we not have saved their lives?

Let's never have to think about that about our government today. We don't want to learn that lesson all over again.

So here to help us bring attention to these problems, the Honorable Ed Rendell. He served as the 45th Governor of Pennsylvania. Served as a member of the Democratic party, was elected to government in 2002, his office began in January 2003. Recently a member of the Democratic Associations Executive Committee and served as the Chairman to the Democratic

National Committee during the 2000 presidential election.

Governor.

(Applause.)

MR. RENDELL: Thank you all. I think you should all move to Pennsylvania. Thank you very much for that warm welcome. I wish we could say we deserve it.

We have been trying very hard to accomplish many things. All of you, all of us up here and the many other friends of the residents of Camp Ashraf here in this country, the many generals, many elected officials, the many professors, we have been trying very hard to influence things but we're not there yet and I despair every time I come here about where we are.

Now, I normally speak at sort of the tail end of the program. I'm speaking at the beginning. I have to go back to Philadelphia. I have a book coming out, my first, and after the experience of writing my last book, but it's coming out and I have a live TV

show at 2:00 o'clock in Philadelphia.

But my book is called a Nation Of Wussies, which means someone who is afraid to do what's right, afraid to act upon their own convictions. They chicken out, as the kids would say.

Really, it's interesting, I was thinking about what I was going to say today and I have some substantive things I want to say to you. But this is all about two agencies or two institutions that I have tremendous respect for not being willing to show the counsel of their convictions and do the right things and that's the United Nations and the United States of America. Two institutions that I grew up believing were the hope of the world and in both cases, the U.S. and the U.N., have not done the right thing for the residents of Camp Ashraf. They have not.

The United States has a special responsibility because we entered into a contract with the residents of Ashraf. Each and every resident has a signed contract from us saying we will protect you, if you disarm, we will protect you. They disarmed.



And you've heard from General Phillips and others that the disarmament was complete. Colonel Martin will go over that today. They disarmed. Did we will fill our obligation to protect them? No. In 2009 we didn't and in 2011 we didn't. As a result 47 people are dead and hundreds more were seriously injured.

Now, when the fight is on for what's going to happen to the remaining 3,400 residents of Ashraf, the United States is not acting with the courage of its convictions.

The United Nations stepped in and we were told by our own government, by the State Department, the MOU was signed between the U.N. and the government of Iraq and the MOU would take care of the residents of Ashraf to make sure they would be held in a place that met humanitarian conditions. In a place that allowed them to bring their personal property, to bring their automobiles. That they would be taken care of in every way. And the MOU has routinely been violated and hasn't been lived up to in almost any form, shape that you could conceive of.

And yet, we do nothing. The United States doesn't do anything and the U.N. doesn't do anything. We don't do anything to make this even agreement.

Let's take a look at what the residents of Camp Ashraf have done. Because of the leadership of Madam Rajavi, every time we have been asked to do something, we have agreed. Sometimes compromising the things that we want to do.

As many of you know, there are six or seven of us on a routinely weekly basis get on the phone with the Ambassador Fried, who is Deputy Secretary of State, and we discuss the movement. And Ambassador Fried will tell us, well, you have to talk to Paris and get them to do this, this and this.

We get on the phone and we talk to Paris or we do it through e-mail and we get Paris to make one compromise after another. And then Paris has to convince the residents of Ashraf. They do it not because they like it, not because they think it's fair but because they believe in the overall mission. They want to leave Iraq. They want to go to a place where

they can be free as individuals and not live in fear and they think that making these compromises is going to get them there.

But each time we compromise, the other side, the government of Iraq taking its orders from Tehran, doesn't live up to their side of the bargain.

We have seen convoy after convoy. We have heard from the State Department. Let's just get this convoy moving and then we'll deal with these problems after this convoy is gone because if we don't get this convoy moving something bad can happen. That's what we always hear. Something bad can happen.

We weren't so worried about something bad happening in 2009 and 2011. When 2009 happened, we didn't reposition American troops to live up to our bargain to protect the residents of Ashraf, did we? But we're worried that something bad might happen. That this arrangement is going to get derailed.

So we're asked to compromise. They're never asked to live up to their side of the bargain.

Just recently, I guess a few days ago,

Madam Rajavi wrote to all of us, her friends in America, pushing the cause of the residents of Camp Ashraf and pushing the cause of de-listing. She asked us to ensure that seven things were done. I want to read them to you. I think many of you are aware of them. For those of you who are not, I want to read them to you because when you're finished hearing them, you'll be shocked.

One, she wants Camp Ashraf to be inspected now by either U.N. or U.S. forces. Why? So we can prevent when residents of Ashraf are gone, so we can prevent the planting of weapons as an excuse of doing something against the residents of Ashraf.

We saw our own State Department lawyer essentially mislead The Court by saying that the State Department wasn't satisfied that there had been total disarmament. Fortunately Colonel Martin and General Phillips and others they went nuts because they were responsible for overseeing the disarmament and they went public and said, yes, we can tell you the disarmament was complete because we oversaw it,

American Generals and Colonels oversaw it. That State Department lawyer did not tell the truth.

We wrote the Justice Department asking them to inform The Court that what their lawyer said was incorrect and the Justice Department hemmed and hauled and then didn't do anything. That's the way it goes.

Madam Rajavi wants an inspection of the camp by independent observers so they can record there are no weapons, so the Iraqis can't come in and plant weapons after the fact and use that as justification.

Second, she wants an agreement going forward before the 6th convoy leaves that there will be adequate utilities vehicles for transport of water, fuel and sewage. Easy to agree to. You remember in convoy five, the utility vehicles, took off and left Ashraf on the way to Liberty but halfway there, they were told to turn back that they couldn't go to Camp Liberty.

Number three, the disabled. Madam Rajavi asked for six housing containers and three specially equipped vehicles to take care of the disabled

residents of Ashraf as they move to Liberty.

Number four, that Camp Liberty as swiftly as possible be connected to the electrical and water grids of the city of Baghdad so we don't have to worry about bringing water trucks in. We don't have to worry about generators, that we'll get our electricity and water from Baghdad like every other citizen.

Number five, green space for recreation, canopies for shade. Construction of sidewalks so the older residents and the disabled can walk freely without fear of tripping or falling.

Number six, a guarantee that the immovable property and what personal property remains in Ashraf can be sold. In fact there's an Iraqi businessman who made a reasonable offer for that, but the government of the Republic of Iraq refuses to let that agreement go forward. Refuses to let the property be removed by the merchant and the money given to the residents of Ashraf.

Seventh, a guarantee that, especially in light of Ambassador Kobler's trip to Tehran, a

guarantee that the Iranian government will have no say over the disposition of the residents or the residents' fate.

Now, Madam Rajavi, as you know, is a very well-spoken person and she often coins phrases that are right on topic.

She said at the end of this, I believe the most striking thing about this list is its modesty. Meaning, we're not making outrageous demands. These are basic, simple demands and we have told Ambassador Fried and I think there's an agreement among Paris, unless these demands are met, we're not sending the 6th convoy. Because if we send the 6th convey and the last convoy and everybody is in Liberty, we lose every remaining leverage we have.

So the time for us to stand and the time for the U.S. Government to take the stand and the United Nations to take the stand and enforce that MOU and tell the government of Iraq that it must comply, that time is now. There's no time for excuses.

Because look at what's happened here. The

Iraqi government has been harassing, mean and cruel for no purpose of their own. Not to save money. Not for any strategic or security reasons. Consider some of the things that have happened since we have been in this process relocating residents.

Number one, when the vehicles arrived at Liberty we're not allowed to use forklifts to take the heavy material off. That would be easy.

Instead, the residents have to painstakingly carry it off by hand. Why wouldn't they let us use forklift? How is that going to endanger the security of the Republic of Iraq or cost money? We're willing to pay for it ourselves. It's mean and cruel.

Next, we hear all about it's difficult to get the water down. Ambassador Kobler said the water will be hooked up sometime before Ramadan. That's two months from now. We have been told the same things, it's coming next month. It's absolutely ridiculous.

The residents of Ashraf have said, let us do it. We can connect it ourselves, the water. We can't connect the electricity. But we can connect the



water ourselves at no cost to you. They wouldn't let us do it? Why? As Mr. McColm said, why? There's no explanation for it.

Electric, the same thing. "We'll see, we're working on it." Yet at the same time we're not allowed to buy fuel from Iraq. We have to go outside the country to buy fuel and the costs are outrageously high. They're depleting resources. Why? Is there any reason for that? Is there anything you can think of that the government of Iraq benefits from that other than just being mean and cruel and harassing and doing the bidding of Tehran.

Shade, something as simple and basic to human beings. You heard Mr. McColm talk about 120-degree temperatures. They originally agreed to allow the mesh to be brought in the camp. The residents purchased the mesh, it came to the front door of the camp, it was turned away and the residents couldn't get their money back because they already paid it. It wasn't the contractor's fault. It was turned away and there is no shade in 120-degree temperatures.

There are 300 air conditioners, working air conditioners at Ashraf. The residents wanted to bring them over. The air conditioners that were at Liberty are not functional. The Iraqi government had someone come in, they reported they were not functional. They wouldn't let them bring the air conditioners over.

We don't get enough fuel to gas the few cars that are in Camp Liberty and we're not allowed to hire an outside contractor to spray against the insects, snakes and the like.

None of these things are important strategically. They're all to just create pressure on the residents for whatever reason. It's hard to fathom. Maybe they want a lot of the residents to throw up their hands and say I'll go back to Iran. I don't want to go back. If we have to live here the next two or three years, maybe we'll just go. And that would suit the purposes of the regime and Tehran for whatever reason.

So I think it is time without a shadow of a doubt for us to draw the line in the sand. For us to

tell the United States Government and tell the U.N. no more coddling the government of Iraq. It's time for us not to be wussies. It's time for us to stand up and do what's right. Ensure there are humanitarian conditions every way, shape or form; shade, water, air conditioning. The basic things that are necessary to survive.

It's time for us to insist that the government of Iraq lives up to the MOU that the Memorandum of Understanding that they signed voluntarily and willingly they signed it.

It is time for the U.N. to declare Camp Liberty a refugee camp, not a temporary transit location but a refugee camp. It's a joke to call it a temporary transfer location.

How many months have some residents been there? It's not five months and there hasn't been one person allowed to immigrate yet, not one. There hasn't been one person processed. We're looking at, if things got speeded up immediately, we're looking at a two to three-year process. That's not a temporary transit

location. That's a refugee camp.

But if the U.N. categorizes it as a refugee camp, certain rights would adhere to the residents to the camp that for some reason the U.N. doesn't want to give them because they're afraid for some reason of the government of Iraq.

We need to de-list and as Mr. McColm said it's up to us up here. It's up to all of you U.S. citizens as loud and clear say, all right, we have done what you asked us to do, now de-list. De-list so we can speed up the process of getting countries to accept our residents.

(Applause.)

MR. RENDELL: It is time to speed up the process. Ambassador Fried told us last week in the phone call that the U.S. is going to begin processing people in June. Now, again, we have heard it before. You've heard it before. France, England, where are the nations of the world?

I'm sick and tired, no offense, but reading all of these letters from European members of

parliament, et cetera, about what's going on, having all of us up here decrying what's going on. We need action and the only way to get action is for the United States Government to tell the Republic of Iraq no more -- try to put this in a way that I can for public usage -- no more.

(Laughter.)

MR. RENDELL: I'm trying, all the words in my head -- no more pussy footing around. Best I can do. It's time to live up to your agreement. It's time to stop being gratuitously mean and cruel and petty. It's time to let the people live in humanitarian conditions. They've done everything you've asked them to do. Paris has done everything. The residents have done everything. It's time for basic fairness.

I grew up believing that the United States and the United Nations were the basic and final enforcer of basic fairness. The enforcer of what was right and fair and honest. To give people the basic rights they're entitled to.

I want to pledge to you this: We have been

harassed, most of us ourselves, but as we said when these subpoenas first came out we're not going to stop. This is way beyond what it started out to be.

It was a humanitarian effort on all of our parts in the beginning and we are going to see it through. I can only wish that we did something, myself individually, all of us cumulatively, the people here today and aren't here today, they're warranted that type of applause. We have tried and we will continue to try and we will be relentless and we will stand up and we will be heard but we have to succeed in the name of Ashraf.

(Applause.)

MR. TANCREDO: Thank you. I'm told that our next speaker is here. Yes. Okay. You know, Pennsylvania, I'm not sure exactly why, but it is giving us some of the greatest, most --

(Applause.)

Pennsylvania Governor line up here. Tom Ridge, first United States Secretary of Homeland Security under George Bush. 43rd Governor of

Pennsylvania from 1995 to 2001 and prior to that served as a member of the United States House of Representatives 1983 to '95.

Currently Mr. Ridge is the founder and CEO of Ridge Global, LLC a Washington D.C. based security consulting firm. Author of the "Test Of Our Times," "America Under Siege" and "How We Can Be Safe Again." Tom Ridge.

(Applause.)

MR. RIDGE: Thank you. First of all, I want to thank you for that gracious introduction and your very warm reception.

It's good to be with so many of my colleagues and the individuals with whom I've worked off and on both politically and in terms of policy. Great to be part of this distinguished group of panelists. I want to thank you for your invitation to join you today.

Oh, there has been so much said, so much to be done and our collective efforts are to be recognized, applauded, but we still have a long way to

go. My first thoughts of deep appreciation and gratitude to all of you and your colleagues not only in this country but around the world.

I realize that what the panelists do here overseas is give confidence and hope to the men and women in Ashraf and Liberty; but frankly you are the strongest most resilient advocates that any group seeking humanitarian relief has ever had in my judgment in the history of the world and you are to be applauded as well.

(Applause.)

MR. RIDGE: This has become very, very personal. I'll speak for myself but I dare say to all of us. I take a look at my friend, Wes Martin, and know how personal it is to him because he lived and worked with the people of Ashraf. And some of the other military leaders who lived and worked and got to know and respect and understand their desire for democracy, for regime change, for living in peace with their neighbors, living in a community and society that accepted diversity of thought, diversity of religion.



A society that was not nuclear, a society that wanted good relations with the West instead of antagonizing the West. So all of us have seen from one time or another and spent some time with family members.

I mean, I got to tell you, every time I've been privileged to interact with family members it's painful when, for them, when they show me the pictures of people who have been murdered and assassinated by the Mullahs. We know that story, since 1979 over 120,000 the estimates are 80 or 90 percent of the members of the MeK. It's been a continuous staying effort to deny the voices of democracy for well over, almost 30 years.

So we get to a point and talking about the nuclear Iran and at the risk of being somewhat repetitive, I want to just take a quick glimpse of history and kind of set the stage for where we are today and what our expectations should be and what our responsibilities should be as we continue to sustain our effort, humanitarian effort, to get the men and women from Ashraf to Liberty and resettled with their

family members and loved ones around the world.

It's not that far back, '79, but then we remember what happened in Beirut a couple of years later. You can trace that to the Mullahs, Khamenei. And in the Embassies in Africa and the bombings.

Remember President Bush's speech when he talked about the axis of evil. Clearly Iran is one of the countries that lie, well, not only are they -- well, they are the number one terrorist state in the world.

We all know they support Hamas, Hezbollah, Islamic Jihad. They're joined at the hip with Syria. And for those who think that United Nations resolutions and condemnation has any impact on Iran, they just need to look in the region and see what has happened in Syria.

U.N. sanctions and U.N. condemnation statements are normally ignored and regrettably tragically a loss of 12,000 Syrians, men, women and children. They'll continue to be condemnation but little action. Talks, but little progress.

So we get to the point now where we're during all this time the United States has been involved in both bilateral actions with Iran. But let's take a look at the record of the United Nations itself. 2006 resolution I think it's 1696, the U.N. strongly condemned an appeal to Iran to terminate its enrichment activities. Strongly condemned in 2006 and there have been six resolutions since 2006, six resolutions.

While we continue to go the U.N. and frankly there have been a lot of bilateral efforts to bring additional pressure on the Iranian regime and many, many series of talks, more sanctions, more talks and more centrifuges.

You say to yourself, the talks have not been terribly successful. The sanctions are probably squeezing the lower middle class. But the more we talk, the closer they get to the kind of enrichment they need for nuclear weapons.

I'm reminded, if you don't mind a little levity. My daughter now is a wonderful woman but as a

child when I was a young congressman I brought her to town and she sat with dad. I took her to the congressional office. And I remember one time we were getting ready to leave and I turn on CSPAN and they were debating something I thought was frivolous. I said we're going to go get dinner or clothes, we're getting out of here so we're going.

She had occasion to be talking to my wife at the time and she turned on the speaker of CSPAN and put the telephone receiver up to the TV and said, did you hear that -- my little girl is five at the time -- she said mommy, talk, talk, talk, that's all they do is talk.

(Laughter.)

MR. RIDGE: I think this very young, prescient lady, now a fine young woman, would say the same thing with regard to our talks with Iran. Our discussions. We agree to meet. And everybody looks at it as a success. Well, we had a conversation, you know what we did? We agreed to meet again.

Well, during these, some people may look at

it as progress, I think all of us look at it as a delay. Obfuscation. The more we talk, the more we dig, the faster the centrifuges spin.

So what's the answer? Regime change.

(Applause.)

MR. RIDGE: Looking at some reading I noted President Obama once said, "let there be no doubt America is determined to prevent Iran from getting nuclear weapons."

The conversations don't appear to be taking us to that resolve or that resolution. At one point in time I think we said we don't want you to have nuclear power. Well they've got nuclear power and heavy water reactors, they got those. And I guess the next would be nuclear weapons.

The only answer is regime change. At the heart of this effort, we all believe that, is to recognize the Democratic opposition. We know what we're talking about, it's the MeK. I mean, this is an extent -- if I were preaching to men and women and sharing a vision and a hope and aspiration that you

have in your hearts and head for the longest time and we're just here to reinforce it.

But the fact of the matter is we know that, in order to move men and women from Ashraf and Liberty and resettlement to loved ones there has to be de-listing. We also know as much as we'd like that to happen that decision is in the hands of the Secretary of State.

We know there have been judicial hearings and who knows what that outcome will be. But there are a couple of things that need to be done even before that outcome when they're finally de-listed.

One is that we certainly need to have a habitable, humane environment as they move from Ashraf to Liberty. We call on the administration.

(Applause.)

MR. RIDGE: Many of us are involved in correspondence, phone calls, but the plea is simple. Understanding de-listing is a decision for which we will continue to advocate but there's still the need to provide decent living, habitable conditions so that

while the U.N., moving rather slowly at this point, moves hopefully more aggressively in the future in the resettlement process that people can live in decent surroundings. What do we beg for before the 6th convoy moves? What do we want?

It would certainly be nice if the U.N., and here's where they have a role to play in addition to the U.S., we're not categorizing them as the asylum seekers, they call Camp Liberty a refugee camp. Give them that protection. While you're at it, how about electricity. How about water on a regular basis. How about simple provisions for the disabled and the elderly. There's a long, long list.

I think the United States has some leverage. I believe the U.N. has some leverage. It's my sincere hope before the 6th convoy moves -- remember there have been many assurances given and very few delivered during the past five convoys. Memorandums of Understanding, as I understand it, have been negotiated I think prior to the movement of every convoy.

If you did a checklist with regard to all

the memos you would find that very few of the promises made were kept and it's about time the Maliki government kept its word and it's about time the United Nations and the United States exerted far more pressure, far more leverage to the decision makers in Iraq to deliver to the promises they made to the United States when the change of status of forces agreement was concluded several years ago.

My commitment to this cause can be distilled down to a time when I happened to wear the uniform of my country a long time ago in a far away place called Vietnam. And in my enormous respect for the men and women in our military, here we are a couple days after the Memorial Day.

But when the United States being represented by our United States military gives a signed pledge to every single resident at Camp Ashraf, you are assured the protection of the 4th Geneva Convention and we will provide for your safety and security, that's a pledge the United States has made and that's a pledge that all of us would do everything



we can for as long as we can to make sure they keep it.

Provide the humanitarian conditions. We're hopeful they'll de-list the MeK. One of these days instead of meeting in Washington we can all meet in Tehran.

(Applause.)

MR. TANCREDO: In my career as a congressman we would periodically, our office would have to contact somebody over at the State Department. When you wanted to talk to somebody over there in charge for a particular area with a particular country you ask for that desk. You say I'd like to speak to so-and-so on the Canadian desk or Afghan desk.

I used to tell my staff, call over there and ask for somebody on the American desk. And they would say, American desk, there is no American desk. That's the problem. There is a problem.

Some of the very perverse things that come out of the State Department, some of the stuff that seems counterintuitive I've never been able to understand it. They also seem incredibly intransigent.

And I have the same feelings oftentimes about the United Nations.

Now, our next speaker is someone who can perhaps explain the illogical actions taken by both organizations. Since he served in the belly of both of those beasts. Diplomat lawyer. Spent many years in Public Service from August 2005. U.S. Permanent Representative of United Nations, 2001 to 2005. He was Under Secretary of State for Arms Control International Security. Ambassador Bolton is currently a foreign and national security policy senior fellow in the American Enterprise Institute and his Op Ed articles are regularly featured in the New York Times, Wall Street Journal and Washington Times. John Bolton.

(Applause.)

MR. BOLTON: Thank you very much. I'm going to decline Tom Tancredo's challenge because there isn't enough time to explain it all. But thank you very much for the invitation to be here today. Thank all of you for coming out and thank all of my fellow panelists for being here as well.

I wanted to touch briefly today on the situation with Iran nuclear weapons program because while we quite rightly focus on the plight of the people at Camp Ashraf and focus on the larger fate of getting refugee status and getting out of Iraq and developments in Iran broadly, I think with respect to the nuclear weapons program we could be coming to a very, very critical point. This has to do not with political or diplomatic hype or spin or speculation. It has to do with the physics and the physics have to do with the continued progress the regime is making toward its long sought objective of a deliverable nuclear weapons capability.

Now it's in connection with the regime's nuclear weapons program I first saw the work that they were doing, the MeK, exposing to the world information about the illicit activity. The activity by the regime that violated their commitments under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Violated their agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency. Violated the comments that routinely made publicly that their

only purpose in pursuing nuclear related research was for civil power purposes and as the evidence accumulated over the years, what I saw that was classified when I was at the State Department often had a chance to compare with what the MeK was releasing publicly and it was really remarkable.

The coincidence of accuracy between what the MeK said publicly and what we knew privately and while there were good and sufficient reasons why the U.S. Government didn't disclose much of this sensitive information, I have to say I was uniformly happy what the MeK did to show how serious this problem is.

You know, people like myself and government can talk about the threat of nuclear proliferation, it sounds very abstract. When you think about it, it's been 50 years since we have had an atmospheric nuclear test.

When I speak to college students and talk about the threat of nuclear proliferation, to them a nuclear explosion is some grainy black and white TV footage from the late '40's or '50's. It's like a

different world to them.

I'm not suggesting we resume atmospheric testing for educational purposes, but I'm saying that the reality of nuclear threats is something that's a little bit distant from people's experience.

So to have information about the regime's activities made public I felt was very important. And I think what we're seeing right now is that this 20-year long effort by the regime is getting perilously close to success.

We have had just in the past week yet another report by the International Atomic Energy Agency based on information that the IAEA has, it's essentially public information. Not based on anything we don't know about. But based on what they see publicly there's already a sufficient stock of low-enriched uranium for the regime to fashion into five or more nuclear devices with a little bit more work on the enrichment process.

We had seen, despite all the hype and hoopla about the Stuxnet virus and now the Flame virus.

And I'm in favor of all these viruses. But production rates at Natanz and Fordow facility are now double or triple what their previous high levels were.

The production of enriched uranium, anyone that knows anything about nuclear weapons is the long pole in the tent toward developing weaponization capability are proceeding essentially unhindered. New generations of centrifuges much more efficient with much greater capacity prepared to be introduced. And this progress of building a broad and deep nuclear infrastructure continues.

And in the meantime, while this work proceeds right in front of us, the United States as it has for 20 years is still trying to find ways to negotiate with this regime.

This is a faith that goes beyond religious faith. You can't find empirical reality that justifies the continuation of this negotiation. There simply isn't any evidence for it. Let's look at the current round.

With great fanfare and the five parliament

members in Germany met with regime negotiators in Istanbul and had several days of negotiations.

When they finished they declared it was a great success. Much progress made. What was the tangible outcome? They agreed to meet five weeks later in Baghdad. Well let's pop the champagne.

Diplomacy is the only profession on earth where success is defined as having another meeting. Where was that meeting? Baghdad of all places. My goodness, an interesting selection.

So we go to Baghdad and we hear reports that the IAEA is close to reaching agreement over access to the Parchin facility, an armor artillery missile base where the regime has undoubtedly been testing the high explosive component critical to weaponization to taking the enriched uranium with plutonium in the pit of a nuclear weapon, compressing it into critical mass and creating the uncontrolled chain reaction that the nuclear weapon is designed for.

And negotiations at Baghdad then come after this happy news from the IAEA. Of course there's no

signed agreement.

Yeah, there are still a few issues unresolved but it's good news. You can count on that.

So the negotiators come to Baghdad. They have two days of negotiation. What do they agree to? They agree to meet again. It's another success. Four weeks later in Moscow. Except this time we find by reports in New York Times -- and you know the New York Times is always right -- but the New York Times reports, this is their word, a frenzy of activities at the end because they couldn't agree on the next city.

They finally compromised on Moscow.

(Applause.)

MR. BOLTON: Maybe the fourth meeting will be in Tehran.

What is this doing? Once again buying time for the regime to make progress toward nuclear weapons. Time is not a neutral factor in diplomatic negotiations. Those negotiations are like all other forms of human activity. Cost and benefits. And the cost of negotiation is the time Iran gets to continue



to move toward that objective.

People talk about the effective sanctions as having a coercive impact on Iran. The director of national intelligence, the Obama administration's own appointee testified to Congress two months ago that all of the existing sanctions had no affect on Iran's behavior or policy in the nuclear field.

The new sanctions we see coming into effect this summer may have an economic impact but there's simply no evidence they've done anything to slow down the Iranian nuclear weapons program.

In fact, if anything all of the attention to the sanctions, to Stuxnet and Flame to other covert activities against the program simply divert us from the pressing reality that they are getting closer and closer to their objective. Without even knowing whether there are activities inside Iran, inside North Korea, inside Syria we don't know about.

Now, it may be that there will be military action against these facilities. This is a very unfortunate outcome. But one that's predictable given

that the threat that the nuclear weapons in the hands of that regime would have.

I think the answer here is that this has to be coupled by a declared policy of the United States Government and our friends in Europe. That not only are we opposed to this regime having nuclear weapons, we are opposed to this regime period and it needs to be over-thrown. Thank you very much

(Applause.).

MR. TANCREDO: To show the bipartisan nature of our support, you have to understand that I was at one time an appointee in the Reagan administration. We have had people here speaking who came out of the Bush Administration. Someone I know that served in the Clinton Administration.

And now Phil Crowley, nominated by President Obama as the United States Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, served 2009 to '11. Also spent 26 years in the Air Force, retired in 1999 rank of Colonel. 1997 names Senior Director of Public Affairs for the United States National Security

Council, Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

Ambassador Crowley was named the 2011 and '12 recipient of the General Omar Bradley Chair in Strategic Leadership, a joint initiative among the United States Army War College, Dickinson College and the Pennsylvania State University. Dickinson Law School. Phillip Crowley.

MR. CROWLEY: Thank you very much and good morning. For the past year as the Bradley Chair at the Penn State Dickinson School of Law I've been staring at Tom Ridge's portrait which sits outside the classroom as a non-lawyer teaching lawyers about the National Security environment to the 21st century. Your portrait is good. I, every once in a while, tip it to make sure it's in good shape.

(Laughter.)

MR. CROWLEY: But I'm happy to be back with you. Again, after hearing Ed Rendell and Tom Ridge and John Bolton, I feel like I'm a support act. But just to make sure there is a bipartisan tenure I'll divide

my remarks into three sections and I promise you I will disagree vehemently with John Bolton but respectfully about the status of our nuclear discussions within what's called the P5+1.

But to start off, this is my, I was here last year roughly about the same time and I put my opening remarks in the context of what was then called the Arab Spring, now called the Arab Awakening. But obviously a dramatic dynamic and shift within the Middle East.

Obviously nobody could have predicted what has happened and a year ago I think we all had a greater degree of confidence because of the remarkable events that had occurred in Tunisia, Egypt and were beginning to occur in Libya. Dramatic change that occurred in days, weeks and months

I think we all had then and still do have confidence that no country is immune from the forces of change that have been unleashed in the region and that includes the country of primary focus today being Iran.

That said, I think we are, have a sober

understanding that a year later we do see another force at play, the force being one of resistance. And that has come not only through the intervention of Libya, which was successful, but obviously took longer than we had expected because a leader, rather than bowing to the will of his people decided to turn his weapons against his people.

Now, Libya faces enormous challenges going forward but at least now the people of Libya, as for the people of Tunisia and Egypt have the power to choose for themselves who will govern their country and how.

Now we saw the leader in Yemen also resist. Eventually he was forced to step down. Yemen's transition will be very different, much more incremental, but will clearly take time and require significant international support.

And as we all know there is a genuine tragedy unfolding in Syria. We are shocked, unfortunately probably not surprised, by the lengths to which this brutal regime will go to claim to power at

any cost and just this weekend as we know the killing and execution of men, women and children in the village of Hula.

As the State Department said yesterday we see in this horrible act the impact of Iran which actually bragged about the technical support it has provided to Syria to be able to resist the clear and compelling will of an ever expanding segment of the Syrian people. And this from a government in Tehran which publicly embraced political empowerment for everyone in the region but the people of Iran and the people of Syria.

We also decry the fact that today Assad is able to hold onto power in large part because of the economic, political and in the case of Russia even military support from countries like Russia and China and others that enable Bashar al-Assad to survive, at least for now.

But I continue to believe a year later that it is still inevitable as was said earlier that real change will come and real change will come to a country

like Iran where the people will have not only real politics, which actually as you know do exist in Iran but a real choice as well which does not happen today

Now, having left the State Department a year ago we all have an aspiration for a better world but we have to deal with the world in which we live today. That's where I do, I disagree with John Bolton.

Now, what you heard today was a replay of a policy position that was taken during the course of the '90's that led us into a successful but as the president of the United States said at the time, a catastrophic success in Iraq.

We all want regime change in Iran but we have to figure out how to get there and we have to manage a process to where we open up new possibilities that may inevitably evolve but quite honestly do not exist today and that's why managing a difficult issue, such as the nuclear challenge, the choices are really two:

We can intervene militarily in Tehran, which I think is a disaster and would actually help the

government of Tehran because it would help them change the subject. Or, we can try to manage the challenges in the meantime with talks that are frustrating and unsatisfying but ultimately can test that proposition at the heart of what Tehran is telling the world. A proposition that we should verify and not trust which is if, in fact, nuclear weapons are forbidden, then Iran at some point should be able, this is not a hope, this has to be tested and verified through very significant intrusive inspections eventually, but we have to test that proposition and make Iran prove that its activities, while it brings it close to having the capability to build a weapon if they choose, will never ever make that choice. We don't want to live in the world and people in the region don't want to live in the Middle East that has Iran possessing an actual nuclear weapon.

Now, I'd like to tell you that Iran sits at a tipping point at the strength of the salients. The regime and its policies are in decline in part because of the significant growing pressure of the



international community which has been enhanced by the willingness of the United States and others to engage Iran directly.

Iran is feeling that pressure but all the process of change is going to take some time to evolve.

That's what makes the challenge of Camp Ashraf so salient to all of us. To see the people of Ashraf who represent a real alternative, you know, to the current regime in Iran that they're able to leave Iraq safely and get to a safer place where then they can all participate more fully in convincing the people of Iran that there is a clear alternative and ultimately, as much as we will do everything that we can from the United States, ultimately change in Iran supported by all of us will have to emerge first and foremost by forces inside Iran. It cannot be imposed, you know, from the outside.

Now, we have heard compelling, you know, remarks by Governor Rendell and others about the challenging living conditions that we have. We have talked about the need for deadlines, the need for

actions.

Having been the one person that worked in the Obama Administration, I will tell you and perhaps John Bolton will agree with me that within the State Department today we have a dogged advocate in Ambassador Dan Fried. He is one of our nations distinguished diplomats. He is a, he can be a force of nature. And I trust Dan that he will work as hard as he can to move this process forward.

What we need to do is to help him. I would suggest, as a retired military officer, most of us served in the military, we're all about metrics. You know, what is the absolute measure of success. And I would say in Ambassador Fried's recent testimony, he kept coming back to what I think is the single most important element here. And I think it should be a focus of adding a new deadline, you know, to what we want to see accomplished and what we want to see happen for the people of Camp Ashraf.

You know, Dan ultimately came back and kept on saying over and over again, the real key here is to

not only move people from Ashraf to Liberty, but the real key is moving them out of Iraq to a safer place and that is where the process wall does exist and that is a source of progress. This process has to be better and this process has to move faster.

We do not literally have any time to waste. Barely 20 percent of the residents of Camp Ashraf have moved, have been interviewed by the U.N. This has to get faster and better.

I would say the real deadline that we should continue to press for the United States as a leader in this process is to ask the question over and over again. When will the first refugee leave Camp Ashraf and when will the first refugee arrive here in the United States.

(Applause.)

MR. CROWLEY: Because as someone who has served in government for 30 years, I do believe in the power of the example -- of the power of our example and the leadership of the United States.

MR. CROWLEY: We can more effectively go to

other countries in the world, as Governor Ridge said, where's the rest of the world in this?

We are in a much stronger position when we have opened our door, welcomed the first residents of Camp Ashraf to the United States and then say to the rest of the world, we are doing our share, now it's your turn. That's the day I want to see happen and that's the key metric as we work on the other things, the air conditioners working and so on and so forth ultimately to have this be a credible, successful process. It can't just be moving from Ashraf to Liberty. It's got to be moving from Liberty to somewhere safer and better. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. TANCREDO: Some of us have had the opportunity to visit Iraq for a short period of time. I know that many times I attempted to actually get to Iraq and visit Ashraf but was always refused permission to do so, refused a visa. But we do have someone, as they say, who had boots on the ground there. You know, had eyes there for some time and can talk to you about

the situation there from that perspective. His name is Colonel Wesley Martin. U.S. Army retired from active duty --

(Applause.)

MR. TANCREDO: Apparently you know him.

(Applause.)

COLONEL MARTIN: My brothers, my sisters --

AUDIENCE: We love you.

COLONEL MARTIN: I love you.

AUDIENCE: God bless you.

COLONEL MARTIN: Thank you, my friend. I'd like to today speak once again on behalf of my brothers and my sisters at Ashraf.

(Applause.)

COLONEL MARTIN: One would think with as many great American leaders for democracy that have spoken out and stated that, State Department, you are wrong in having the MeK on the terrorist list, the MeK on the terrorist list. When we have men like John Bolton, Tom Ridge, Louis Freeh and the list goes on and on and on.

As a second lieutenant I learned if everyone tells you one thing and you think something else, maybe you're wrong and you should readjust and come to a better conclusion. And yet the State Department bureaucrats don't seem to get the message.

The invasion of Iraq only succeeded in replacing one brutal dictator with another.

As Saddam, in his early days of power, Maliki has the support of the U.S. Government. Unlike Saddam, every day Maliki aligns himself closer to Tehran while the U.S. administration downplays his connection.

To claim, as Vice President Joe Biden recently did, that Iranian influences is greatly exaggerated is a discredit to all the coalition forces who fought and died and bled in Iraq and to all the Iraqi citizens and the Ashraf residents who have paid that price.

To be part of the solution and to show good faith in the U.N. refugee determination process, MeK leadership agreed to the transfer from Ashraf to

Hurriya.

Now as we all know 2,000 members have made that move. This relocation has been with numerous problems. Continually the call is rendered by the United Nations and the U.S. State Department this relocation requires cooperation of all parties concerned.

The Iraqi government has created one difficulty after another. It should not be forgotten it was the Iraqi government that prevented the United Nations from traveling to and conducting the process at Camp Ashraf.

Furthermore, the officer in charge of this transfer mission is the same person who commanded the 2009, 2011 Iraqi military attacks on Camp Ashraf, General Sadeq.

Camp Hurriya, less than one half of square mile in size, is correctly referred to by Rudy Giuliani as a concentration camp. Before the arrival of the first bus by Ashraf, Camp Hurriya had already been looted by the Iraqi military. Cabinets that could have

been used for storage were intentionally damaged.

The Black-water storage tank ruptured the first day due to lack of maintenance. The water treatment plant built in 2006 by the United States military had been stripped by the Iraqis. Now the MeK must pay for water to be shipped in. The quantity of water has never met any of the population that has been there.

Often part of the problem as U.N. Ambassador Kobler himself, he has proven to be very quick to accept Maliki's word on most everything. Even assuring everyone that Hurriya was in good shape.

The pristine photos he provided to support his claim were not the same facilities our brothers and sisters found upon their arrival. He criticized the residents for the Black-water tank breaking down and blamed them for trashing Hurriya to stage a photo opportunity for unsanitary conditions.

In doing so in his blame it was overlooked the fact that it was United States generated trash. His theory also required it to have been overlooked



during the multiple searches by the Iraqi guards.

Even from, even getting from Ashraf to Hurriya has been loaded with obstacles. The Iraqi government has not honored formal agreements. This includes generators for power, vehicles for transporting disabled people, medical equipment supplies and personal items.

Having worked both with the Iraqi government and the former National Liberation Army of the MeK I can understand what's happened. The denial of supplies and equipment will make life that much more difficult for the residents.

Also, the more that is left at Camp Ashraf means the more the Iraqi government can loot. On the very last convoy two trucks of personal clothing disappeared. When MeK leadership directly questioned General Sadeq on this, he responded the clothing belonged to the Prime Minister's office. The very searches of the convoy and the people prior to departure have been exercises in harassment and brutality. What has been searched gets searched again

and again. The process lasts for a day and a half without rest. It was on this process that a good friend Bardia, a 48-year-old engineer, died of a stroke.

In another instant the Iraqi military beat Ashraf residents to include with batons resulting in 29 MeK members injured. Despite all this torment and all the years of torment, our brothers and sisters at Ashraf have not broken ranks, not one single person has left or defected. That speaks great and that speaks about their dedication to democracy and their dedication to the cause.

(Applause.)

COLONEL MARTIN: Loudspeakers at Ashraf has taken on a different level at Hurriya. Multiple observation posts and patrols inside the camp continually used to dehumanize the residents. Consolidation at Hurriya when life support itself is dependent upon the ever watchful and demeaning Iraqi military supports Mayor Giuliani's position that this a concentration camp. Unfortunately one spark could

easily set this camp ablaze of slaughter that would dwarf the 2009 and 2011 attacks, then Hurriya becomes an extermination camp.

In her testimony to Congress last February, Secretary Clinton stated there have been some minor, minor issues with the transfer to Camp Liberty. During that same testimony when asked about the de-listing, Secretary Clinton stated that it is directly related to the movement from Ashraf to Hurriya.

Once again, this proves Hillary Clinton and her department fails to understand the former National Liberation Army. The NLA was the military arm of the MeK with one mission only: Direct military engagement with the Iranian government, not the U.S., nobody else, not the Israeli government, the Iranian government. It never had any other mission.

NLA membership surrendered every one of their weapons and the leadership signed a cease fire agreement with the U.S. military. You have heard me say many times before, no one despises war more than the warrior. No one despises the breaking of a cease

fire agreement or a surrender agreement than the warriors who secured it and worked it and yet we watched our State Department do exactly that over the honor and the dignity of the United States military.

For Secretary Clinton to associate the move from Camp Ashraf to Hurriya as being part of the requirements for de-listing the MeK requires her belief that somehow out of Ashraf and Liberty under all this Iraqi security they are capable of breaking out, somehow getting to Baghdad International Airport and launching an attack on the United States. It is impossible.

And furthermore, it will never happen because I testify to you today as Dave Phillips has and many others, when we were at Ashraf, the MeK were the best allies we had.

(Applause.)

COLONEL MARTIN: In April, State Department's Ambassador Benjamin stated before Congress that the terrorist designation is dependent upon seeing what weaponry the MeK still has at Ashraf. This was

later repeated and quoted by Robert Lowe at the Court of Appeals and somehow they would have to wait until the Iraqi government got in there to look for all of those weapons.

Dave Phillips has testified before, I have, Leo McCloskey has testified we have gone through that compound over and over again. There are no weapons at Camp Ashraf. And to suggest that the word of the corrupt Iraqi government is to be taken over the American officers who served there is nothing short of despicable.

(Applause.)

COLONEL MARTIN: Once Camp Ashraf is cleared of the MeK the Iraqis will go in to loot just like they did at Liberty and all other U.S. vacated compounds and following the fall of Saddam Hussein.

Evidence then will be generated. Suddenly they will come up with a bunch of weapons and declare that they had been found at Camp Ashraf and the State Department is going to embrace those like a mother embracing her child and say, oh, this is the fact that

we have been looking for.

The State Department intelligence specialists and Hillary Clinton herself claim to have highly classified information about the MeK's terrorist activities. None of that information had been put out for external review. Once again today, Ambassador Bolton, Tom Ridge and I jointly challenge the State Department to produce that information and put it up to our top secret clearances and background investigations.

(Applause.)

COLONEL MARTIN: On the 23rd of March another blunt, also said, show me the facts, show me the officer. He's still waiting.

Up to this point, State Department has continually been assuring Congress they are aggressively working on a designation that will comply with the court decision. 24 months and going to comply with a six-month mandate is not in compliance. Obviously State Department has a different meaning of aggressively working than the Defense Department. The

U.S. military has spent less time in World War I than the State Department has spent in making this one decision.

As mentioned, the State Department intelligence claims to have classified information that can be shared with no one. These are the same exact people who declared Saddam had weapons of mass destruction. They paid Chalabi \$33 million for that information. Now 4,500 American warrior deaths later the State Department intel is serving Hillary Clinton no better than they served Colin Powell.

I further submit to the United Nations executive branch, the United States executive branch and the United Nations are doing no better to support an effective resolution to the Ashraf situation than either organization did to support General Dallaire's heroic fight to stop the genocide in Rwanda. Sadly I see a similar fate preparing to take place.

Yet our State Department continues to stumble along offering appeasements in exchange for dialogue that goes no where. The ultimate victims of

these appeasements are the Iranian people themselves, right now 3,200 former NLA members trapped inside Iraq when U.S.-led coalition forces invaded.

Somehow the State Department bureaucrats think continuing to demonize MeK as terrorist will persuade the Iranian government from becoming more difficult. I fail to understand this logic. The Iranians developed a nuclear weapons capability. Plan to kill the Saudi ambassador on American soil. Is primary supporter of Syrian government. Is determined to destroy Israel. Kidnapped American hikers for half a million dollars ransom each. Sentenced a Canadian citizen to death for alleged spying. Sentenced 12 Iranian Christians to death on Easter Sunday and the list goes on.

It is time to stop appeasing the fundamentalist government of Iran and start supporting humanity. Concerning Ashraf and achieving that goal, the best thing both Canada and the United States can do is to remove the MeK from the terrorist list, hold the Maliki government accountable for its misconduct and



bring former NLA members off to safe locations.

Right now the State Department is saying, okay, we're looking at bringing out 100 to the United States. Right now, before you, I say I am ready at my place in western New York to sponsor 10 members of the MeK.

(Applause.)

MR. TANCREDO: Thank you. Almost every morning when I get up and get to the, this thing that's tethered usually to me somewhere or other I look through it and there's one thing I look for in particular and it's called a Dick Morris Lunch Alert. I get it every day. Except I don't have it today because you're here maybe.

At any rate, I encourage you all to go on-line and sign up for it. Because it's, it gives you a very concise and excellent observation I think on the American public policy.

Dick Morris first came to national attention when he provided the strategy that engineered Bill Clinton come back re-election in 1996 rescuing his

presidency after he lost control of Congress in '94.

Called the most influential private citizen in America by Time magazine. Morris steered Clinton back toward the center and was a key player in the Clinton initiatives that balanced the budget, cut taxes and reformed welfare.

Became known for his probing, insightful, hard-hitting and clear commentary. Domestically Morris has handled winning campaigns of more than 30 Senators and Governors.

Internationally he has piloted the successful campaigns of the president or prime minister of Mexico, Colombia, Argentina, Uruguay, Kenya, Spain Hungary, Poland, Taiwan and Japan. I hope very soon to pick up my BlackBerry here and see Dick Morris Lunch Alert: MeK de-listed.

(Applause.)

MR. MORRIS: You know, Colonel Crowley was talking about what the deadline ought to be. Well, I think the deadline is going to be January 21st, 2013 when we have regime change in the United States of

America. We get rid of appeasement. We get rid of a regime that doesn't know the difference between our friends like Israel and our enemies like Iran. We get rid of an administration that is running out the clock in fruitless, ridiculous negotiations that go nowhere as opposed to standing firm and tall against the Iranian nuclear threat. That's going to change on January 21st, 2013.

(Applause.)

MR. MORRIS: I'm not speaking to you today as a partisan or as an advocate. I'm speaking to you as a predictor. I get elections right in my predictions. And I've run presidential campaigns in 14 countries. I know a winner when I see one and I know a loser when I see one and that's what we're looking at now.

(Applause.)

MR. MORRIS: What would an Israeli military strike on Iran accomplish? It would buy time. The pessimists say a year or two; the optimists say three or four years. But what we need to do is to be certain

that Iran does not develop the nuclear weapon until we get a commander-in-chief who is going to use our force to stop them from doing it. That means we have to buy time until January 22nd, 2013.

I believe an Israeli military strike on Iran is absolutely necessary. I worked with Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu in his campaign. When he hired me the first thing he said to me is it's 1938 and as a Jew I know what that means. That means we're a year or two away from annihilation, from a Holocaust. And the fundamental precept of the state of Israel and of its supporters worldwide, who include a lot of people other than President Obama, the fundamental intent of it is never again. That's an applause line.

(Applause.)

MR. MORRIS: Obama says the sanctions will work. Come on, he didn't impose those sanctions until under Mark Kirk and Bob Menendez from New Jersey made him do it with a joint congressional resolution. And his majority leader is spending full time at his instructions weakening the resolutions to strengthen

those sanctions. So now he's like the cigarette companies who say don't sue us we have warnings on our packs after we fought for years to make them put the warnings on the packs. Obama is saying the sanctions I opposed and the ones I wouldn't put in until you forced me to, give them time to work, they're wonderful, they'll work.

And the Secretary of State once said that she opposed sanctions on Iran that would, quote, hurt the people of Iran. What the hell do sanctions do but hurt the people of the country you're sanctioning?

But on the other hand to have faith that those sanctions would work is to assume that the leaders in Tehran give a damn about the people of Iran. We saw that they don't. How many millions of them do they send to slaughter in a useless, ridiculous war with Iraq that was as corrupt on each side and two regimes trying to force their legitimacy by attacking one another.

How many of their citizens have they slaughtered in the streets during these demonstrations?

Do we seriously believe that this regime will care about the needs and the concerns of its citizens? Do we believe that concern will be enough to get them to close their nuclear program?

Then there are those that say let's let them get right up to the brink, 20 percent, all set to weaponize, but as long as they don't put the dots together we're fine. That's like telling someone put a loaded gun safety off, against my head and I trust you not to shoot it.

The only reason the Obama Administration takes the position is that threat is not aimed at the United States. But for those of us that care about the state of Israel, it is aimed squarely at the state of Israel. And Israel has the means to stop it, will do it, and is entitled to the support of the United States when it does.

(Applause.)

MR. MORRIS: Then there are those that say, okay, let them assemble the weapon. Deterrence worked in the cold war. Deterrence stopped the Soviet Union

from attacking the United States and has stopped China from attacking United States, why wouldn't it work on Iran? Well it doesn't seem to have dawned on the geniuses in the State Department that you can't deter a suicide bomber by threatening to kill them.

(Applause.)

MR. MORRIS: These are not negotiations, these are delay tactics. This is not a good faith effort to try to make it through until we can stop Iran from developing weapons. This is an attempt to put an issue on ice and in the freezer until after the election.

This is an effort to have the illusion of peace so that gas prices stay low enough to permit this president to be re-elected. But it's not going to work because we'll find out on November 7th that he can't fool the American people but we know right now he can't fool the Israeli people.

So I believe that this problem has a solution and it has one that's coming up very quickly and thank goodness it is not dependent on the

government of the United States of America.

Now, as to the situation in Camp Ashraf, what is this nonsense about pressuring the Maliki government. We are the Maliki government.

(Applause.)

MR. MORRIS: I've said all I can to pressure my feet to take me back to my seat when the speech is over. And I will not rest until I have succeeded.

(Laughter.)

MR. MORRIS: The Maliki government is a creature of the United States. The fact that it follows the dictates of Tehran is something that Bush might have considered before he put them in power. And Obama might have considered before he pulled out the troops.

But let's understand the nature of the bargain between Maliki and Obama. It is, you keep things quiet, you permit me to say I pulled out of Iraq without doing violence to the memory of the soldiers who died, you hold things together and I can campaign



on that issue. In the meantime do whatever the hell you want inside of Iraq.

But that is not going to change. Iran is not going to change. Obama is not going to change. Believe me, I know her well, Hillary is not going to change. Until we have regime change in two countries.

(Applause.)

MR. TANCREDO: Now from the halls of academia. Ivan Sascha Sheehan specializes in the intersection of global terrorism, counterterrorism and international conflict management. He came to the University of Baltimore after serving on the graduate faculty of University of Massachusetts, Boston. Frequent speaker on U.S. counterterrorism efforts in the war on terrorism. Sheehan addressed diverse audiences from academic forums in Europe and Harvard Law School, for which we will forgive you --

(Laughter.)

MR. TANCREDO: -- to policymakers on Capitol Hill. His research based on terrorism incident data examines the impact of preemptive forces on the

terrorist activities and the implications for U.S. foreign policy and international human security.

PROFESSOR SHEEHAN: Good morning to you all. Dick Morris and the gentlemen on this panel are difficult acts to follow. But I thank you for your applause. My students rarely applaud me. But it's a pleasure to be part of this important panel at this momentous time and in this very historic venue.

I'll begin my remarks this morning with a brief story. I was part of a panel, a round table several weeks ago at George Mason University. And the matters on the table were similar to the issues being discussed today: The de-listing of MeK, the failure to protect residents of Camp Ashraf and Camp Liberty from violent political retaliation by the Iranian regime and the growing realization on the part of a bipartisan group of senior government officials, policy analysts and academics alike that MeK is a valuable partner to the United States and for too long --

(Applause.)

PROFESSOR SHEEHAN: -- and for too long

commitments to MeK have not been honored and broken promises ensued. Now, on the panel I was joined by the very distinguished Alan Dershowitz, U.S. Attorney General Michael Mukasey and Ambassador Lincoln Bloomfield, Jr. Over the course of our hour together we found that we shared a great deal in common.

All of the panelists agree that MeK's current designation as a terrorist group was the naive result of an effort to curry favor by then President Clinton with the Iranian government. And that the designation should be challenged and ultimately overturned.

All of the guests agree that the failure to protect the refugees at Camp Ashraf and Camp Liberty constitutes the worst broken promise and an injustice that must be made right.

And all of the guests agreed that to use a phrase made famous by President Kennedy, MeK stands on the right side of history. The right side of history. Against clerical rule, against proxy violence, against state sponsored terrorism and against the mistreatment

of women.

Because of the hard work of so many of the people in this room MeK is increasingly viewed as a valuable and courageous voice of dissent and the primary voice of opposition to theocratic rule in Tehran.

(Applause.)

PROFESSOR SHEEHAN: Tehran's violent ways, their dishonest diplomacy and their ongoing pursuit of weapons of mass destruction stands in direct contrast to MeK, an organization that has renounced violence and is working to promote grassroots change in Iran so that she can some-day live at peace with her neighbors but while there's growing recognition that the Iranian opposition represents the future, we are currently faced with a challenge of momentous consequence and today we stand at a cross roads.

Last week, as you know, six world powers resumed discussions with the world in Baghdad to avert a nuclear crisis. While I agree with President Obama on several matters and several policy descriptions, his

decision to pursue discussions with the Iranian regime is not sensible and it is dangerous.

As I wrote in an editorial this week, history suggests that diplomatic engagement with Iran is a fools errand. There is today no cause for optimism and there is no hope that these ongoing talks will lead to a peaceful solution to this nuclear standoff. And there are certainly no grounds for the Security Council's claims of progress through diplomacy. Iran only wants to buy more time with these talks.

Consider this: After not one but two prolonged discussions, no concrete proposals from the diplomatic efforts in Istanbul or Baghdad have been realized and a timetable for inspections of Iran nuclear facilities has not been achieved. As the great powers now prepare for a third round of talks, this time in Moscow, we're likely to hear the same empty rhetoric and we together must challenge it.

Western officials will again downplay the prospects for an immediate breakthrough. Negotiations

will be deemed a long process. Trivial concessions will be framed as political victories. And not surprisingly Iranian officials will herald the talks as fruitful and call for continued cooperation.

The result? The world will be, stage will be set for more broken promises and Iran's influence will grow in a region readying itself for the inevitable power vacuum created by a smaller U.S. footprint in Afghanistan and Iraq.

This I think you'll agree is a troubling, a troubling legacy for a U.S. president to face with the prospect of a single term and it constitutes a blemish on an otherwise impressive foreign policy.

The Obama Administration's unwillingness to forcefully leverage hard and soft power to address the Iran problem underscores a combination of naivety, unwillingness to face the threat posed by Tehran, and a troubling sense that international conflicts make for bad electoral politics.

As the talks drag on, Iran's self-appointed leaders buy precious time to pursue their ultimate goal

of a nuclear arsenal. And more troubling, the world is held hostage to the posturing of a rogue regime with a long history of promoting instability and proxy violence.

But it's not too late to correct these mistakes and it's not yet too late to ensure that U.S. security interests are not jeopardized.

If the Obama Administration is listening and I'm hopeful they are, I recommend five immediate steps before the next round of negotiations commence.

Number one, the U.S. should signal Iran that if negotiations fail to achieve substantive ends, the U.S. or other world powers may choose to act with force to curtail Iran's nuclear plants while the conventional discourse here in Washington frames the options available to the U.S. Government as only involving diplomat engagement or tactical military strikes. We know that there are other options.

You and I know that regime change can also take place from within. Covert action can be used to frustrate and set back Iranian nuclear plants. But

support for Iranian opposition is also imperative.

Nevertheless, if negotiations fail to succeed the possible use of force and the potential for the removal of Iranian officials must be put squarely on the negotiating table. It must be clear, discussions cannot and will not be used to buy time for the pursuit of dangerous weapons that will destabilize the region. The failure to engage in honest diplomacy will have consequences.

Number two, MeK should be formally removed from the U.S. Department of State Foreign Terrorist Organization List and recast as the political alternative to theocratic rule in Tehran.

(Applause.)

PROFESSOR SHEEHAN: Correcting the list to reflect Iranian government will be checked with support for a grassroots movement that can challenge its authority.

Number three, U.S. officials should demand that International Atomic Energy Agency officials be given unfettered access to Iran's so-called peaceful



nuclear program and Tehran should be made to furnish evidence of its halting of uranium to weapons grades levels.

Number four, U.S. officials should step up political and economic sanctions and build support among world powers to do the same. Over the past year, existing economic sanctions have taken a toll inside Iran and Iranians are increasingly holding their government accountable.

A European oil embargo that would take effect on July 1st is a necessary means of further ripening the negotiating environment, exploiting Iran's ongoing troubles and ensuring future compliance with negotiated concessions.

Finally, number five, the U.S. must take responsibility for the protection and ultimate resettlement of refugees housed at Camp Ashraf and Camp Liberty and you must insist that U.S. policymakers live up to their commitment and their pledges to the promotion of human rights.

These measures will have, I promise you, an

impact at the negotiating table. But Iran's well-earned reputation for being masters of diplomatic sleight of hand as well as their long history of working against U.S. interests should also be taken into consideration by U.S. negotiators in Moscow. Tehran's sophisticated use of threat and accommodation to ensure its own political interest must be seen for what it is and the recognition that as some in this room have suggested no package of concessions or incentives will dissuade Iran from its current course must be considered.

The window for diplomatic action is closing rapidly. And current talks in Istanbul and Baghdad have left unresolved key issues. Iranian sincerity must now be checked with calls for substantive action.

The primary fountainhead of terror in the modern world cannot be allowed to hold the world hostage by raising hopes and dashing expectations only to buy time for the illicit pursuit of a nuclear power stock pile.

Now, while I'm doubtful that next month's

talks in Moscow will result in these concrete proposals of which I speak, the talks do serve a purpose.

Iranian intent is now abundantly clear and Tehran's reputation for breaking promises and their unmistakable efforts to use negotiations as a means of buying time for nuclear armament. These things are all confirmed and they're not visible to the world.

But while the situation seems grim, I'm increasingly hopeful. In your valuable work, in your determined efforts, in your courageous and sustained effort to shift American policy in a manner consistent with U.S. vital national interests and the U.S. commitment to human rights, I see enormous progress.

Your voice has helped to recast the voice of MeK as the voice of Iranian resistance. Your voice has led to this bipartisan recognition that the existing government in Iran is an illegitimate partner whose commitments cannot be honored. And your voice has led to the growing recognition of the brave and honorable Iranian opposition and all that they stand for.

(Applause.)

MR. SHEEHAN: Together we have much work to do but I'm confident that if together we stand on the right side of history our ongoing work will lead to an Iran that is at peace with your neighbors and an Iran that is a partner to the United States. Once again, it's been a privilege to join you this morning and this distinguished panel and I look forward to our continued work together.

MR. TANCREDO: Oftentimes when I was in Congress and confronted by people who were critical of my support for the MeK, it was based on what they would say and it was based on the idea that it was information that we had somewhere in the bowels of the intelligence community. If I only knew what that was and I would recant and stop my continued efforts on behalf of the MeK. So I would ask them all the time, let me see this stuff.

Periodically they would arrange for these meetings in which they would lay out all this material and I would read through it. And at the end each time,

I would say is this it? This is it? This is what you have that you tell me so it's critical for me to know and understand before, in lieu of my support.

So we have someone who can give us a perspective from that security and intelligence community, it's Colonel David Hunt who has over 29 years of military experience including extensive operational experience in special operations, counterterrorism and intelligence operations.

Most recently Colonel Hunt served as tactical adviser in Bosnia where he facilitated all national intelligence matters for the commander in chief, as well as coordinating a \$350 million National Security Program for the National Security Agency and the CIA.

Prior to this he served as counterterrorism coordinator to the summer Olympics games in Seoul, Korea. His role as a leader began with the special forces operation on detachment of 12 soldiers expanding to command a brigade of over a thousand personnel. Colonel David Hunt.

(Applause.)

MR. HUNT: I was about to break the primary rule of a guest speaker. Never, ever, ever be the last guest speaker out of 10, 10 minutes before lunch. But fortunately, I'm the second to last speaker and I'm ahead of a Kennedy which is never, ever going to happen in my life again.

(Laughter.)

MR. HUNT: Thank you very much for inviting me and allowing me to chew candy down there at the end, waiting to come up and talk to you.

I had the real privilege during the time of the Shah, some of you were old enough, to serve in Iran with the special forces. We did some jumps and some training, some work with the very tough group of people in the mountains called the Kurds, some of us are familiar with. And at the time play games with the Iraqi military was a good operation. I was very proud of it. And jumped with the Iranian special forces and never, ever thought all of these years later I would have a clean sheet in bed at the Willard Hotel and come

down and talk to you. It's a big day.

There's some real practicality to whatever all of us have been talking about today and you've been talking about it for years. I was, I had shown to me last night by a friend, it's actually called The Fallen For Freedom. I call it the book of the dead. There's 120,000 people who have been killed, murdered, executed. Families destroyed since the regime in Iran has existed. This is what we know.

You can't, I mean, it's big, heavy. One volume. And it's got pictures of men, women and kids and entire families that were wiped out.

My point of showing you this is that, there's real, besides the rhetoric and the sadness of Camp Ashraf and what it represents, but there are absolute consequences in life and death that you have suffered dear friends but are actually represented in this book. It's staggering to see and it's actually one volume.

So my point to us all is all nice and well and good to have us all here at the Willard Hotel

pontificating but there are people really dying because of what's happening in Iran. So I want to make that point.

My point is short, being never one to talk too long before a Kennedy would be this, I'll ask us all to think of what happened, what is tomorrow going to be like? Of course, of course you want to take whatever the word decapitate, remove, vote out, undermine, destroy, kill a leader of a country or leaders of a country who are obviously this evil as what's happening in Iran supporting Hezbollah and Hamas, killing American soldiers in Iraq and on and on and having a camp like Ashraf even necessary.

My point, it is a very, very difficult thing, number one, to do that. From a practical standpoint, it ain't easy to do what we want to do.

If that's not easy, the second point is even tougher and that is you have to have, and witness what happens when we do not, Egypt and Libya being great examples, when you remove a leader or a group of leaders and you do not have the person you want



standing next to them to take over, you have a thing called chaos and then chaos, your military organization in this case the intelligence services, or the people worse than the Mullahs, will take over. And you have more death and more destruction and more chaos created.

One of the, this is one of the greatest countries of the world I've been lucky to serve in 30 years of the uniform and I wouldn't want to be any other place. But one of the things we do not do well, United States of America, is think about tomorrow. We're very good right in front of our nose, very, very good at today. We really suck at tomorrow.

And in helping you change your regime, making Iran the country it was when I trained with your special forces up by the Caspian Sea is a very, very difficult thing to do and we have not done well when it came to Iraq and not done well when it came to Afghanistan after the fighting during this nation building things.

Another thing I want to leave with you is this: If the intelligence community is correct and

they have never been 100 percent correct, information that was fed to them by some of you in this room, about the number of things, places that Iran has been trying to build and assemble nuclear weapons, if they're all true, that would be the first time the intelligence has been that accurate.

And secondly, if the Air Forces of Israel and the United States hit every target they aimed at, it would also be the first time in the history of any Air Force anywhere that ever hit anything they claimed they were aiming at. If that all works and you could actually penetrate some of the facilities, and some of this has been provided in our intelligence community being built, you would have nuclear buster bombs, you just started a nuclear war. As a small point we may want to discuss at a later time with a country that is probably developing nuclear weapons, but okay, if you could penetrate those 40-story deep, some of you have been in Baghdad, I was, we got to go into some tunnels and buildings that the Iraqi government had built deep in the ground.

We did a shock and awe campaign, whatever the hell that meant, but somebody came up with the term shock and awe. It wasn't, by the way, it sounded good on television, but it wasn't, but those tunnels in Iraq were still fully lighted, fully air conditioned and fully livable after the United States Air Force, which is a great Air Force, I love our brothers in blue, dropped tons of bombs in the tunnels and we walked around, it was lit up as the Willard. Those were Iraqi built tunnels.

The Iranian facilities are better built than the Iraqi tunnels were 20 years ago. So it is not an easy process.

I'm not suggesting eventually it doesn't have to happen. But if all that happens, it's 100 percent perfect and there actually is WMD there, that would be nice. But if it all happens, the Iranian government and the Iranian people have got a capability in Hamas and Hezbollah and the. So tomorrow is critical to what you want to do with this regime and with and with the great freedom fighters in there and

the memories of 120,000 people that have been killed. There's a practical aspect to all that's in this room and I would say military standpoint, intelligence standpoint that it's the day after you have to consider. And if we cannot -- by the way, as a government we did not answer what's going to happen tomorrow in Iraq or Afghanistan and we have lost thousands of guys and spent billions of dollars because we did not answer that question. It's still not being answered. If you can't answer what it's going to look like in Tehran tomorrow, you cannot do the action you're talking about today.

Yes, we free these people. Of course the camp has to close. We get them all out. We owe them that. It's a minimum we owe people, we promised their lives as a minimum.

But the larger issue of changing over a country to something that you like has to have in its plan as important as the taking away of the leader what you want to do about tomorrow. If you can't answer that, you can't today. We just tried it.

Recent history says -- we had a guy, (he says his name I can't understand him) we paid all these millions of dollars. He's going to get off the plane and take over, we didn't even let him off the plane. He was going to be the new guy, no. And we had what we had for all those years in Iraq.

And we have a guy we like in Afghanistan, he talks great English, he's our friend, we used to love him.

(Laughter.)

MR. HUNT: Until -- we forgot his brother was a crook.

(Laughter.)

MR. HUNT: We, by the way we were paying, the intelligence community was paying his brother while he was a crook.

My point to you is that we have a not very good history, as well-intentioned as we are and as great as our soldiers are. For you, you need to learn our lesson, which you cannot do tomorrow, you cannot do today unless you can answer what it's going to look

like tomorrow. We take care and respect your dead, our friends, and we take care of the people we promised, but the bigger issue you must answer is what about tomorrow.

God bless and good luck in this thing.

(Applause.)

MR. TANCREDO: We were just commenting on so many occasions it seems like the United States has forced public policy decisions around the world to make decisions based on the lesser of two crooks.

In this case, of course, we have something totally different. For once we have somebody, a group of people completely committed, solid in every single way and people that I certainly believe in and that we can believe when they say something about their ideas, their positions and what they're going to do can take that to the bank and that's you guys.

(Applause.)

MR. TANCREDO: Now a former colleague of, mine, representative Patrick Kennedy. Mr. Kennedy is a former U.S. representative for Rhode Island's first

congressional district serving from '95 to 2011. Member of the Democratic party. Member of the Kennedy family. Son of the late U.S. Senator Edward M. Kennedy from Massachusetts. At the time of his father's death he was the last remaining member of the Kennedy family to serve in an elected office in Washington, D.C.

(Applause.)

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you very much. I'm honored to be with you once again and to share this podium, to show you how united we are that even on this stage represents the cross-section of the American political points of view from among the more conservative members of Congress and administration officials and political advisors to even the left, like a Kennedy, on the liberal side of the Democratic party.

I just want to say to all of you, as Dick Morris points out, running a successful political campaign means you need to have as many people on your side as is possible because your objective is the same thing that unite all of us and that is we want to see a new day in Tehran where democracy is rule.

(Applause.)

MR. KENNEDY: So perhaps it's worthwhile to reiterate what we agree on, both Democrats and Republicans, conservatives and liberals.

That is, we agree on the fact that U.S. foreign policy today towards Iran is backwards. We have labeled the main opposition to Tehran, the MeK, as the terrorist group while we negotiate with the real terrorists and those are the Mullahs in Tehran.

(Applause.)

MR. KENNEDY: We have a humanitarian disaster and instead of the United Nations working to transfer the people of Ashraf to a safe location, we have Martin Kobler from the United Nations working to transfer people from their homes to a torture chamber in what is formerly Camp Liberty. Backwards.

Today we read in the newspaper about the tragedy in Syria where hundreds were killed over the weekend, women and children.

And the United Nations while that is happening is negotiating with Bashar al-Assad. And



Bashar al-Assad's people are putting out that he didn't really do it, it was an Iranian-led militia group.

We're reminded, once again, that when we talk about dealing with the terrorist state of the Mullahs in Tehran we're talking about terrorism not only internal to Iran, we're talking about terrorism and killing that's happening today in Syria because of Tehran.

And the fact that Tehran is one of the few remaining supporters internationally of Bashar al-Assad. Do we need another lesson as to what we're dealing with when we have these examples readily in front of us?

My contention today is what we need to do is send a separate signal to those that have been suggested today. And you've heard today how we need to threaten Tehran with force. You've heard today how we need to make sure that there are consequences, if sanctions don't work and negotiations don't proceed.

It is interesting that the State Department says two different things about the MeK. One, they

say, well, they're very unpopular in Iran. We don't want to align ourselves with the MeK because it will impugn our support for the real Democratic efforts within Iran.

Well you've seen from that book that Colonel Hunt pointed out that Tehran has done everything they can to literally kill every member of the opposition including 120,000 Iranians who supported the MeK.

And why does Iran want to make sure that MeK remains on the terror list? Because they see the MeK as a mortal threat to their existence in Iran.

(Applause.)

MR. KENNEDY: I would propose that the United States take advantage of one of the options at its disposal that could get the support of all the left and the liberals and the Democrats who may not be as enamored with Dick Morris's view of how we should change regimes in Tehran. And that is to say how many Americans want more Americans to die on battlefields in the Middle East? I dare say that would unite both

Democrats and Republicans who are sick and tired of Americans spilling their blood in the Middle East.

I would venture to say that if you told the truth to the American public and you said to them that there is an option. We're seeing it in the streets all across Syria where people are rising up against the people who are brutally repressing through the dictatorship of Bashar Assad and yet they're still doing it and they're turning out in the streets. My faith is in the people of Iran to turn over and challenge --

(Applause.)

MR. KENNEDY: -- and as Colonel Hunt said, who's going to be there the day after tomorrow? It's going to be the people of Iran who have to live with the consequences.

(Applause.)

MR. KENNEDY: And I believe they need all the help they can get. And why it is U.S. foreign policy to tie the hands behind the most organized opposition, the best financed opposition, the most

politically connected opposition, the MeK. It does not make sense to me when I see the Syrians plead for international, financial and political support to help them overturn Bashar Assad.

If we gave the Iranian people your support and you are spread around the world, the diaspora of Iran stretches back to the Shah, the Mullahs. It's made up of the most successful Iranian people in that society. They are ready to finance and overthrow. The United States has to get out of the way and let them do it.

(Applause.)

MR. KENNEDY: I want to let you know that my heart, as your heart, goes out to the poor people who are suffering as political pawns in this game and those are your families in Camp Ashraf.

I believe we need to make good on making sure they're treated as the refugees that they are. And wasn't it fantastic to hear Colonel Wesley Martin talk about how important they were to the United States.

(Applause.)

MR. KENNEDY: We can do a lot of things simply by de-listing. We can unleash this great Democratic opposition, finance it and support it without U.S. boots on the ground. We can avert, most importantly near term, we can avert a human tragedy that is bound to take place if we continue to list the MeK as a terrorist organization because that's nothing but a pre-text for the Iraqi puppets of the Iranian regime to murder members of the MeK in Camp Liberty just like they did two times before.

We don't need to repeat this disaster. We need to make sure that this administration knows that they can do the easiest thing and the humanitarian thing. And as a politician, I always liked to do things that were both right and politically correct and could save the world. I think we have got an agenda. All of them are aligned by de-listing the MeK. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. TANCREDO: You've heard from a number

of people who I had introduced as former something or other. We have the pleasure now of talking -- I have the pleasure of introducing someone who I can tell you is the present congresswoman Judy Chu. She serves in the House Judiciary Committee, member of the Crime Terrorism Homeland Security, 2011.

Dr. Chew was elected as the chair of Congressional Asian-Pacific American Caucus. The Congresswoman has been supporting the rights of Camp Ashraf residents and she was elected as a member of Congress from California. Please welcome her.

(Applause.)

MS. CHU: Well, I am here to say that I will always be here for the residents of Camp Ashraf. I will never forget when I saw a tape of them. They expressed their wishes to me to help in their struggle. And I was so moved to hear the very words from them that talked about their struggle and the imminent change that was taking place. I was moved to tears.

Thank goodness, because of your efforts, the camp was not massacred. That was my greatest fear,

that would have been unbelievable.

But there is still so much more to do. I am so mortified that the residents who have been taken to Camp Liberty cannot even take their possessions with them. That's not right.

And I was mortified to hear that the residents cannot even have special trucks to help the disabled. That is not right.

And I was mortified to hear that they don't even have the most basic of facilities in Camp Liberty. It is not even in basic condition to accept all these camp residents and I say that we should not continue transferring them until Camp Liberty is in a shape to accept them.

(Applause.)

MS. CHU: And, of course, the U.S. must and can do more. The very, very basic thing it must do is remove the terrorist designation for MeK.

(Applause.)

MS. CHU: I have to say that you are amongst the most dedicated that I've ever seen. You

have come and done briefings in D.C. You've contacted so many officials and we have heard from you. That is why you have so many officials here at your briefings. This is why I came today.

I think that you are amongst the most effective and amazing advocates I've ever seen.

Those residents of Camp Ashraf need you. They need you to be as effective as you can be because it is a matter of life and death.

But I do want to tell you, you have touched my heart. And for sure I will be there with you side-by-side every step of the way to make sure that we finally get freedom for the residents of Camp Ashraf.

Thank you all very much.

(Applause.)

MR. TANCREDO: So, once again, we conclude a meeting that I hope was productive.

I must say over the time with the many years in which I've been involved with this particular issue I am incredibly, well, I'm uplifted to see what's happening here today. Because what you see is what



representative Kennedy referenced. An incredible amount of people from an incredibly diverse background all coming together for one purpose.

I do not think, I cannot remember anything that I have seen in public life, frankly, any issue in my public life that has garnered the support of so many people from some diverse political backgrounds. Former congressmen on both sides of the aisle. Former Ambassadors serving in different administrations, Democrat and Republican. Present Congress people supporting on both sides of the aisle. Advisors to several presidents. This is really an amazing thing.

But there's something that I find even more incredible each time we do this and I mention it I guess each time but it is to me astounding, that is where else, in what other situation, what other time can you recall having people banding together, people who are Jews, Christians and Muslims, all banding together asking the Almighty for His support and His protection of Camp Ashraf or of an issue like this, where else is this ever going to happen?

(Applause.)

MR. TANCREDI: And so I am convinced that our political leaders cannot turn a deaf ear to this kind of pressure. And I am also convinced that the Almighty will not turn a deaf ear to our prayers. Thank you all.

(Applause.)

(Proceedings concluded.)